

REMARKS

Status of the Application

Claims 1-7 and 9-21 are all the claims pending in the application. Claims 15-16 and 18-19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. Claims 1-3, 5-7, 11, 14 and 20 and as best understood, are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Genovese et al. (US Patent 5,201,436). Claims 9-10, as best understood, are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Genovese et al. (US Patent 4,201,436) in view of Nakayama et al. (US Patent 4,818,236). Claims 4, 12-13 and 21 would be allowable if rewritten or amended to overcome and the drawing objection set forth in this Office action. Claims 15-16 and 18-19 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent from including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims and the claim rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, and the drawing objection set forth in this Office action. Claim 21 would be allowable if rewritten to overcome the specification objection set forth in this Office action. Claim 17 is objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims and the drawing objections.

By this Amendment, Applicants are amending claims 1 and 16-18, and are cancelling claim 15.

Drawings

The drawings are objected to by the Examiner.

Specifically, the Examiner alleges that the drawings fails to disclose: 1) the plurality of grooves recited in claim 1, 2) the second insulative sheet being formed with a plurality grooves as recited in claim 4, 3) a plurality of grooves recited in claim 15 and 4) the wire fixing portions each including a plurality of grooves as recited in claim 17.

1) With regard to the plurality of grooves recited in claim 1, Applicants submit that element 38 as shown in FIG. 1 corresponds to the recited wiring member, element 30 as shown in FIG. 1 corresponds to wire fixing portions, and elements 32mx, 32nx, 32my and 32ny each may correspond to the plurality of grooves recited in claim 1. Thus, Applicants request the Examiner withdraw the objection to the drawings with respect to claim 1, as all of the elements of claim 1 are clearly shown in the drawings..

2) With regard to the second insulative sheet recited in claim 4, Applicants submit that the annotated FIG. 1 filed January 25, 2008 shows the second insulative sheet being disposed between wires 6₁ and wiring member 38. Further, as noted on page 11, lines 8-12 of the instant Specification, an insulative member 15 *shown in FIG. 4* may be provided between the wires 6₁ and the wiring member 38. FIG. 4 clearly shows an insulative member having a plurality of grooves identified by element 16. Thus, Applicants request the Examiner withdraw the objection to the drawings with respect to claim 4, as the second insulative sheet is clearly disclosed in FIG. 1, FIG. 4, and described at page 11, lines 8-12 of the Specification.

3) With regard to the plurality of grooves recited in claim 15, Applicants again note that FIG. 1 shows element 38, which corresponds to the recited wiring member, element 30 which corresponds to wire fixing portions, and elements 32mx, 32nx, 32my and 32ny each of which may correspond to the plurality of grooves recited in claim 1. Further, element 38a corresponds to the recited rectangular plate body and FIG. 1 shows that the each plurality of grooves, 32mx, 32nx, 32my and 32ny, are disposed at the side edge portions of wiring member 38. Further, FIG. 5 shows that the ends of the wire groups, 31mx, 31nx, 31my and 31ny, are fitted into the plurality grooves, 32mx, 32nx, 32my and 32ny, and held in first direction and second direction, respectively. Thus, the drawings sufficiently show all of the elements of claim 15.

4) With regard to claim 17, Applicants submit that the above arguments with regard to claims 1 and 15 also apply to claim 17. In other words, element 38a corresponds to the recited rectangular plate body, element 30 corresponds to the recited wire fixing portions at the four edge portions of the rectangular plate body, and elements 32mx, 32nx, 32my and 32ny correspond to the plurality of grooves. Further, FIG. 5 shows the first pair of wire fixing portions, which contain plurality of grooves 32mx and 32nx, and second pair of wiring fixing portions, which contain plurality of grooves 32my and 32ny, being disposed parallel to the second direction and first direction, respectively. Thus, the drawings sufficiently show all of the elements of claim 17.

Specification

The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

Specifically, the Examiner alleges that the Amendment submitted January 25, 2008 introduces the following new matter into the disclosure: 1) in claim 1, “the wiring member comprises a plurality of grooves ... or one of the second electric wires” and 2) in claim 21, “the wiring member comprises a plurality of grooves ... or one of the second wires.” The Examiner submits that neither element is adequately supported by the Specification.

With regard to both claims 1 and 21, page 9, lines 18-21 note that the wiring member 38 has wiring fixing portions 30 integrally formed in four side edge portions of rectangular plate body 38a. See also, FIG. 1. These wiring fixing portions 30 each have a plurality of grooves 32mx, 32nx, 32my and 32ny which at least partly hold one of the first or second electric wires, 31mx, 31nx, 31my and 31ny. See also, FIG. 5, and page 15, lines 7-18.

Thus, the Specification fully supports the amendment to claim 1 and new claim 21.

Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. § 112

Claims 15-16 and 18-19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

With regard to claim 15, the Examiner alleges that the limitation “the plurality of grooves” is confusing because it is not clear that the plurality of grooves cited in lines 3-5 refers to the plurality of grooves recited in claim 1 or previously recited in claim 15, line 2.

With regard to claim 18, the Examiner alleges that the limitation “corresponding grooves” is confusing because it is not clear that the corresponding grooves cited in lines 2 and 4 refers to the plurality of grooves recited in claim 1 or previously recited in claim 17, line 3-4.

Applicants hereby amend claims 17 and 18, and have corrected the subject matter of claim 15, which is hereby written into claim 1, in order to cure the deficiencies noted by the Examiner.

Allowable Subject Matter

Claims 4, 12-13 and 21 would be allowable if rewritten or amended to overcome and the drawing objection set forth in this Office action.

Because the drawing support claim 4, as noted above, claims 4, 12-13 and 21 are patentable over the applied art.

Claim 17 is objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims and the drawing objections.

Applicants hereby write claim 17 in independent form. Thus, claim 17 is immediately allowable.

Claims 15-16 and 18-19 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims and the claim rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, and the drawing objection set forth in this Office action.

Based on the amendments to claims 17 and 18 noted above, claims 18 and 19 are allowable at least by virtue of their dependency from claim 17. The subject matter of claim 15 is

hereby written into claim 1, and has been corrected to cure the deficiencies noted with respect to 35 U.S.C. § 112. Claims 16 is patentable at least by virtue of its dependency from claim 1.

Claim 21 would be allowable if rewritten to overcome the specification objection set forth in this Office action.

Because the specification objection may be overcome as noted above, claim 21 is patentable over the applied art.

Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. § 102

Claims 1-3, 5-7, 11, 14 and 20 and as best understood, are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Genovese et al. (US Patent 5,201,436).

Applicants hereby amend claim 1 to include the subject matter of claim 15. Because the subject matter of claim 15 is noted as being allowable, these amendments place claim 1 in condition for immediate allowance.

Claims 2, 3, 5-7, 11, 14 and 20 are patentable at least by virtue of their dependency from claim 1.

Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 9-10, as best understood, are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Genovese et al. (US Patent 4,201,436) in view of Nakayama et al. (US Patent 4,818,236).

Claims 9 and 10 depend from amended claim 1. Therefore, claims 9 and 10 are patentable at least by virtue of their dependency from proposed amended claim 1.

Conclusion

In view of the above, reconsideration and allowance of this application are now believed to be in order, and such actions are hereby solicited. If any points remain in issue which the Examiner feels may be best resolved through a personal or telephone interview, the Examiner is kindly requested to contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below.

The USPTO is directed and authorized to charge all required fees, except for the Issue Fee and the Publication Fee, to Deposit Account No. 19-4880. Please also credit any overpayments to said Deposit Account.

Respectfully submitted,

/Dion R. Ferguson/

SUGHRUE MION, PLLC
Telephone: (202) 293-7060
Facsimile: (202) 293-7860

WASHINGTON DC SUGHRUE/265550

65565

CUSTOMER NUMBER

Dion R. Ferguson
Registration No. 59,561

Date: September 3, 2008